DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 157 CS 506 075

AUTHOR Johnson, John R.; Kusmierek, Lori A.
TITLE Evaluation Research Practices among Human Resource Training Consultants.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (73rd, Boston, MA, November 5-8, 1987). Smudged print may affect legibility.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Skills; Corporate Education; Instructional Effectiveness; Professional Continuing Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Human Resources Professionals

ABSTRACT

A study examined the frequency and type of evaluation research methods used by human resource training consultants. A random sample of 106 human resource (HR) training consultants were surveyed and asked to respond to a series of questions concerning the evaluation practices they used in planning, implementing, and assessing communication training programs. Findings suggest that: (1) HR consultants, for the most part, did not conduct needs analyses while planning communication training programs; (2) the majority of HR consultants did collect data on trainees' attitudes toward communication training programs; (3) the majority of HR consultants did not measure changes in cognitive, affective and psychomotor behaviors or job performance that may occur as a result of participation in communication training programs; (4) experimental and quasi-experimental designs were used by only a very small percentage of HR consultants; and (5) cost benefit analyses were seldom used to assess the economic effects of communication training programs. In sum, these findings suggest that the use of systematic and controlled evaluation research presently is not being undertaken by HR consultants when they carry out communication training programs. (Author/ARH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED292157

Evaluation Research Practices Among Human Resource Training Consultants

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John R. Johnson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

John R. Johnson
Department of Communication
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, WI 53201
414-962-1055
414-963-5539

Lori A. Kusmierek
Data General Corporation
4440 Computer Drive, Mail Stop D-134
Westboro, Massachusetts 01580
617-870-7567

Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention
Boston, Massachusetts. November 1987.

CS506075

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the frequency and types of evaluation research methods used by human resource training consultants. A random sample of human resource (HR) training consultants were surveyed and asked to respond to a series of questions concerning the evaluation practices they use in planning, implementing, and assessing communication training programs.

The findings suggest that: (1) HR consultants, for the most part, do not conduct needs analyses while planning communication training programs; (2) the majority of HR consultants do collect data on trainees' attitudes toward communication training programs; (3) the majority of HR consultants do not measure changes in cognitive, affective and psychomotor behaviors or job performance that may occur as a result of participation in communication training programs; (4) experimental and quasi-experimental designs are used by only a very small percentage of HR consultants; and (5) cost benefit analyses are seldom used to assess the economic effects of communication training programs.

The findings of this study suggest that the use of systematic and controlled evaluation research is presently not being undertaken by HR consultants when they plan, implement, and assess communication training programs.

Evaluation Research Practices Among Human Resource Training Consultants

During the past decade the training of employees in work related behaviors has become one of the major growth areas in profit and nonprofit organizations. It has been estimated that in 1985 alone, United States corporations and governments spent approximately $215 billion to train employees (Carnevale, 1986).

A five year comparison (1982-1986) of the human resource (HR) training courses offered in United States profit and nonprofit organizations reveals that communication has consistently been among the most prevalent content areas. Other areas have been: management skills/development, supervisory skills, and technical skills/knowledge (Feur, 1985; Gordon, 1986; Gordon, Lee, Zemke, 1984; Lee, Welo, Zemke, 1983; Zemke, 1982).

Examining the cost of HR training reveals that in 1986 approximately 21% of the total amount spent on HR training was used to pay for the services of external (paid on contract, not a regular employee of the organization) HR consultants (Feur, 1986). HR consultants or vendors, as they are sometimes referred to as, are hired by organizations to <u>plan</u> (design & develop a training program), <u>implement</u> (provide the training) and/or <u>assess</u> (determine the instructional, job performance, and economic effects) of various types of HR training programs. Approximately 24% of all communication training programs are designed and delivered exclusively by HR consultants, 30% by company based or internal HR trainers, and 47% by a combination of consultants and internal HR trainers (Gordon, 1986, p.54).[1]

Evaluation research is understood to be a central activity of HR training. For example, recent HR training models have underscored the importance and centrality of evaluation research (e.g. Johnson, 1986; Laird, 1978; and Nadler, 1982). Furthermore, the directive for the integration of evaluation research into the planning, implementing, and assessing of HR training programs has been articulated by numerous HR training practitioners and researchers (e.g. Brandenburg, 1982; Burke, 1969; Hisle, 1984; Catalanello and Kirkpatrick, 1968; Dunn & Thomas, 1985; Goodacre, 1957; Kelley, Orgel & Beer 1984; Zenger, 1982).

The purpose of this study was to determine the frequency and types of evaluation research methods used by HR consultants during the planning, implementing, and assessing phases of communication training programs.

Evaluation in HR Training Programs

The evaluation research practices of HR trainers previously have been investigated. For example, Catalanello and Kirkpatrick (1968) conducted two surveys of a random sample of 154 firms listed in the American Society of Training and Development membership directory. The purpose of the studies was to assess the degree to which HR trainers evaluated management development programs. The first survey determined that 78% of the HR trainers used some form of implementation questionnaire, 50% measured instructional effects, 54% assessed changes in job performance behaviors, and 45% conducted some form of cost benefit analysis. In the second study another questionnaire was sent to approximately half of the original firms. Of the HR trainers that

responded, 74% indicated they used pretest and posttest experimental designs to measure changes in knowledge and understanding. Forty-five percent of the respondents measured job performance behaviors, with only 57% (of the 45%) measuring job performance behaviors before training.

Munson (1983) surveyed 103 East coast HR trainers and found: (1) 41% of the respondents evaluated HR training programs solely on the basis of implementation reactions, (2) 40% percent asked the participants' supervisors to observe and report on participants' performance and, (3) less than 7% of the HR trainers reported measuring any form of observed job performance behaviors. When the HR trainers were asked why they didn't collect data during all phases of training (e.g. planning, implementing and assessing) they cited the lack of: time and staff, reliable methods, results that would be useful, and cooperation from other organizational employees.

Brandenburg (1984) surveyed HR trainers from the Chicago Sales Training Association and the Training in Business and Industry Special Interest Group and assessed the types of evaluation methods used by members of these two groups. The HR trainers indicated that open and closed ended questionnaires and observed job performance measures were the most frequent methods used to collect data.

Johnson and Kusmierek (1987) surveyed internal HR trainers to determine the evaluation practices used in planning, implementing, and assessing communication training programs. Their findings suggest that internal HR trainers, for the most part, do not

conduct needs analyses during the planning of communication training programs however, the majority of HR trainers do collect data on trainees' attitudes toward communication training programs. In addition, the majority of HR trainers do not measure changes in cognitive, affective and psychomotor behaviors or job performance that may occur as a result of participation in communication training programs. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs are used by only a very small percentage of HR trainers and cost benefit analyses are seldom used to assess the economic effects of communication training programs.

Previous research regarding the evaluation research practices of HR training has revealed limited use of systematic and controlled evaluation practices. While internal HR trainers generally agree that evaluation measures should go beyond determining how much trainees liked a training program (Clement and Aranda, 1982), previous research (Brandenburg, 1984; Catalanello and Kirkpatrick, 1968; Johnson and Kusmierek, 1987; Lippit, McCune, and Church, 1964; Munson 1983) indicates that the majority of HR trainers conduct only implementation (determining trainees and trainers attitudes toward a training program) evaluations.

Research Questions

While previous studies have examined the evaluation research practices of HR trainers they have been limited to surveying in-house or company based HR trainers. At present, no studies have investigated the evaluation research practices of external HR consultants. Given the wide spread use of consultants for planning, implementing, and assessing communication training

programs, it is extremely important that we have information regarding the evaluation research practices of consultants. The present study was designed to provide this information by asking the following two research questions:

RQ1 To what degree do HR consultants evaluate the planning, implementing, and assessing phases of communication training?

RQ2 What research methods do HR consultants use to evaluate communication training programs?

Methods and Procedures

A paper and pencil survey method was employed to answer the research questions. The population surveyed was randomly selected from the 1984 American Society for Training and Development Guide and the Directory of Image Consultants. Between the two sources, 824 consultants were identified as being involved in planning, implementing, or assessing communication training programs. The questionnaire consisted of Likert type questions and several demographic questions and was reviewed by ASTD and ten HR training professionals for relevance and ethical considerations.

A total of 297 questionnaires along with pre-addressed, stamped envelopes were mailed. Accompanying each questionnaire was a letter explaining the purpose of the research project and an appeal to participate in the study. HR consultants who agreed to participate in the study were assured of confidentiality. A total of 106 questionnaires were returned and used in the analyses of the data. The response rate of 35% was considered normal and adequate for the type of population surveyed.

Results

Characteristics of the HR Consultants

Forty-seven percent of the HR consultants reported their highest academic degree to be a masters degree; 27.1% a bachelors degree; 20% a doctorate degree; and 4.7% a high school diploma. The most frequently cited professional titles reported by the consultants were: president (30.8%); vice-president (9.4%); and consultant (9.4%). The types of companies that the consultants serviced were: industrial manufacturing (80.0%); consumer manufacturing (68.2%); insurance (65.9%); health services (60.0%); government (52.9%); education (51.8%); retail (49.4%); utility (42.4%); and military (25.9%).

Evaluation Research Used in the Planning Phase

One of the major research tasks of the planning phase is determining the specific training needs of an organization. A common research procedure used in this process is conducting needs analyses. Several methods can be employed to conduct needs analyses including observation of work behaviors; requesting information through questionnaires, interviews, and surveys; and examining records, job descriptions, and work samples (Steadham, 1980). Needs analyses provide information regarding: (1) job related tasks that employees are not performing to specified standards, (2) desired instructional methods, (3) superior, subordinate, peer and individual employees' self perceptions of job performances, and (4) superior, subordinate, peer and individual employees' self perceptions of the cognitive, affective and psychomotor skills necessary to perform jobs. They can also

provide a wealth of information considered central to planning HR training programs (Lampe, 1986).

The HR consultants, using a five point scale with 1 = very frequently (86-100% of the time) and 5 = rarely (0 -15% of the time), were asked how often they: (1) conducted needs analyses when planning communication training programs and (2) used particular research methods to gather "needs" data. Table one presents these results. Approximately 35% of the HR consultants reported conducting needs analyses rarely or seldom while 41% indicated frequent or very frequent use. To collect needs analyses data, 51% of HR trainers used interviews frequently to very frequently, while 7% and 27% of the respondents indicated using performance appraisals and questionnaires frequently and very frequently, respectively.

Insert Table 1 about here

Evaluation Research Used in the Implementing Phase

Implementation evaluations, also known as program process evaluations, involve collecting and evaluating information and attitudes regarding activities that take place when a HR training program is conducted or implemented. The focus is on measuring and evaluating the attitudes of trainees and trainers regarding a training program's content and instructional activities.

Implementation data are important because they provide information which, when used with instructional effects data, can be extremely helpful when making program and instructor changes.

Numerous methods can be used to collect implementation data including: standard paper and pencil objective questionnaires or rating scales, open ended written responses and structured and unstructured interviews.

Implementation evaluations generally solicit information relevant to determining program difficulty; relevancy of program content to job tasks/performance; clarity of program objectives and content; communication skills of trainer; trainer effectiveness and rapport; effectiveness of instructional practices; and comparative quality of the program in relation to other HR training programs.

Table two summarizes the percentage of time HR consultants measured trainees' attitudes toward communication training programs. Seventy-five percent of the HR consultants indicated that they measured trainees' attitudes for all communication training programs frequently to very frequently and 16.5% indicated usage at a rare or seldom frequency. The questionnaire method was used frequently to very frequently by 72.9% of the HR consultants, while 21.2% of the HR consultants used an interview method frequently to very frequently. Telephone interviews were used by 4.7% of the HR consultants frequently.

Insert Table 2 about here

The HR consultants were also asked to indicate when the implementation data was collected. Table three presents these results. The percentages indicate that 70.6% of the HR consultants collected questionnaire data immediately after a communication

training program, and 17.6% and 5.5% of the HR consultants collected interview and telephone interview data, respectively, immediately after the communication training program. The next largest percentage of HR consultants who collect implementation data collected it one to three weeks after the training (15.3% - interview data; 15.3% telephone interview; and 1.2% questionnaire data).

Insert Table 3 about here

Evaluation Research Used in the Assessing Phase

The final phase of HR training involves determining and evaluating the effects or outcomes of a HR training program. During this phase data is collected, analyzed, and appraisals made of the outcomes of the HR program. The three general types of effects data are: instructional, job performance, and cost-benefits.

Instructional Effects

Evaluating instructional effects requires assessing changes in trainees' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor behaviors that occur as a result of a HR training program. Measurement techniques include written and oral tests, and direct observation. The content of HR training programs are generally based on instructional objectives developed during the planning phase of the HR training process. These objectives integrate cognitive, affective, and psychomotor behaviors into a HR training program as well as providing a means of assessing a training program's

instructional effects. HR training programs achieve their instructional goal(s) if post-training cognitive, affective, and psychomotor behaviors exceed the minimum level set in the instructional objective(s).

Numerous experimental and quasi-experimental designs can be used to determine if a training program is the cause of any changes in trainees' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor behaviors or job performances. These designs control for extraneous variables as well as guard against selection bias in assigning trainees to groups. Common designs used to determine the effects of training include: pretest-posttest-control, Solomon four, time series, and multiple baseline.

Experimental and quasi-experimental designs, by controlling for factors such as differences in trainees, changes in the environment and trainees, statistical regression, etc. and through the manipulation of an independent variable (e.g. the HR training program), provide internally valid methods to assess the effects of HR training programs.

Table four reports the percentages of HR consultants who collected instructional effects data for communication training programs, the percentages of HR consultants who used written and oral examinations, and the percentages of HR consultants who used various experimental or quasi-experimental designs.

Forty percent of the HR consultants reported collecting instructional effects data frequently to very frequently. Of those HR consultants collecting instructional effects data, 25.9% and 9.4% reported using written and oral examinations frequently and

very frequently, respectively. Less than 15% of the HR consultants reported using a pretest-posttest-control group, time series, Solomon four, or multiple baseline designs frequently to very frequently.

Insert Table 4 about here

The HR consultants were also asked to indicate how soon after conducting a communication training program they measured instructional effects. Table five presents these results. The percentages indicate that 38.8% of the HR consultants collected instructional effects data immediately after a communication training program, and 16.5% and 1.2% of the HR consultants collected instructional effects data one to three months and four to six months, respectively, after conducting a communication training program.

Insert Table 5 about here

Job Performance Effects

When conducting communication training programs, HR consultants assert a relationship between participation in a communication training program and changes in trainees' observed job performance. HR training is, by its purpose, designed to change and/or reinforce job related behaviors in order to: decrease an organization's operating costs (efficiency), increase employee's output (effectiveness) or increase an organization's productivity (a combination of efficiency and effectiveness) (Johnson, 1986).

Achieving this purpose is met when trainees' post training observed job performances are greater than or equal to the employees' job performance standards or OJP $\geq$ PS (Johnson, 1986).

Some of the methods used to measure trainees' pre and post training observed job performances include: administering interviews and questionnaires to trainees, as well as to trainees' peers, supervisors and subordinates; observing job performances; and analysis of work samples, absentee records, and performance appraisals.

Table six reports the following: the percentages of HR consultants who collect observed job performance data for communication training programs, the percentages of HR consultants who use the various data collection methods, and the percentages of HR consultants who use various experimental or quasi-experimental designs to measure changes in job performances. Thirty-five percent of the HR consultants reported collecting observed job performance data frequently to very frequently. The three used methods most often were: questionnaires to trainee, interviews with trainee, and interviews with the trainees' supervisors. Ten and fourteen percent of the HR consultants reported using posttest and pretest-posttest designs frequently to very frequently, respectively. Less than 10% of the HR consultants reported using a pretest-posttest-control group and multiple baseline designs frequently to very frequently and less than 4% reported using time series and Solomon four designs frequently to very frequently.

Insert Table 6 about here

The HR consultants were asked to indicate how soon after conducting communication training programs they measured job performance effects. Table seven presents these results. The percentages indicate that 23.5% of the HR consultants collected job performance effects data immediately after a communication training program, and 18.8% and 9.4% of the HR consultants collected instructional effects data one to three months and four to six months, respectively, after conducting communication training programs.

Insert Table 7 about here

Cost-Benefit Effects

The third effect evaluated in the assessment phase involves comparing the monetary costs of a HR training program with the monetary benefits resulting from the training program. Assuming instructional and job performance evaluations indicate positive effects, the question becomes, "Did these changes result in a monetary benefit to the organization?" The outcome variables typically used in cost-benefit analysis include cost reduction in production, employee turnover-retention, and improvements in quality control.

Table eight reports the percentages of HR consultants who conduct cost-benefit analysis of communication training programs and the percentages of HR consultants who collect data on a variety of benefit variables. Less than 19% of the HR consultants reported that they frequently and very frequently conducted cost-benefit

analyses of communication training programs. Of those HR consultants conducting cost-benefit analyses, 19.6% reported that they frequently or very frequently used improvement in morale as a benefit variable. Cost reduction in producing a product was used the second most often with 18.8% of the HR consultants reporting the use of this variable on a frequent to very frequent basis.

Insert Table 8 about here

Discussion

The results of this study suggest that needs analyses are not used the majority of the time or by the majority of HR consultants when they plan communication training programs. Needs analyses data is extremely important to planning effective communication training programs. Assessing job related tasks that employees are not performing to specified standards; desired instructional methods; superior, subordinate, peer and individual employees self perceptions of job performances; and superior, subordinate, peer and individual employees self perceptions of the cognitive, affective and psychomotor skills necessary to perform jobs are crucial to developing effective communication training programs.

Previous research investigating the frequency that company based or internal HR trainers perform needs analyses has resulted in inconsistent findings. Ralphs and Stephan (1986), for example, surveyed HR managers and professionals from Fortune 500 companies and asked the respondents to indicate the percentage of time they used six different needs assessment methods (e.g. interviews, questionnaires, analysis of records and reports). Three of the six

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

methods were reported to be used "almost always" by over 50% of the respondents. Johnson and Kusmierek (1987), however found that only 12% of the HR trainers reported conducting needs assessments on a frequent to very frequent basis. Regardless of this difference, the fact remains that both in-house and outside HR trainers and consultants are for the most part not conducting needs analyses prior to developing communication training programs. This is a major shortcoming and should be corrected.

The vast majority of HR consultants reported conducting implementation evaluations frequently or very frequently for communication training programs. The most frequently used method was a questionnaire administered immediately after a communication training program. A very small percentage of HR consultants reported collecting any form of data three months or more after a communication training program.

These findings are very consistent with those reported in previous research involving internal HR trainers. Catalanello and Kirkpatrick (1968) concluded that 78% of their respondents conducted implementation evaluations by measuring trainee attitudes toward training programs. Ralphs and Stephan (1986) found that 86% of the HR managers/professionals population surveyed indicated "almost always" measuring trainees' attitudes. Similarly, Johnson and Kusmierek (1987) found that 71% of internal HR trainers used implementation evaluations for communication training programs.

The present study, similar to other studies (e.g. Johnson and Kusmierek, 1987), also found that an extremely small percentage of HR consultants performed implementation evaluations three months or

more after conducting communication training programs. The practice of measuring trainee reactions immediately after training while avoiding the internal validity problem of history may not reflect long term attitudes toward the HR training program. Kelley, Orgel and Baer (1984) concluded: "Research has shown all too often that questionnaires completed immediately following training can reflect people's positive expectations about the training's effectiveness, but that those expectations disappear quickly" (p.32). Given this, HR consultants may want to conduct implementation evaluations over an extended period of time in order to measure trainees attitudes toward communication training programs.

An examination of the percentage of HR consultants conducting evaluation research during the three phases of HR training programs reveals that evaluation of the implementation phase (in the form of assessments of trainees' attitudes toward communication training programs) is the most common form of evaluation research. The results of implementation evaluations must be interpreted with caution. The majority of implementation evaluations, excluding those using observational measures, rely on self-report data. Self-report data are individually based attitudes or perceptions and do not reflect actual knowledge and/or behaviors. With self-report data, there is no way to be sure that trainees or HR consultants' responses accurately reflect what is, or was, actually happening in a communication training program. Many researchers have noted the limitations of self report-data and caution should be given to make sure these limitations are not ignored when using

this type of evaluation data.

The most dangerous problem with implementation evaluations, while not limited to self-report measures, is the "error of association". HR trainers and consultants often assume the results of implementation evaluations and instructional and job performance effects evaluations to be the same. They forget that implementation evaluations can not provide information as to whether a HR training program did or did not increase trainees cognitive, affective and/or psychomotor behaviors or whether the program resulted in employees increasing their job performances.

To assume a positive relationship between trainees' or trainers' level of satisfaction and instructional and job performance effects is extremely gratuitous. While, there is research reporting: moderate positive correlations between student evaluations of instructors and student learning (Blackburn & Clark, 1975; Braskamp, Caulley & Costin, 1979; Cohen, 1981; Doyle, Crichton, 1978) and; low positive to negative correlations between course structure-organization and student learning (Braskamp, et al., 1979; Cohen, 1981), the number of studies is limited and the findings do not indicate high positive associations between the results of implementation and effects evaluations.

The present study found that instructional effects evaluations of communication training programs by HR consultants was limited. Catalanello and Kirkpatrick (1968), on the other hand, report that 74% of the HR trainers in their study measured knowledge. However, the Catalanello and Kirkpatrick research does not report the percentage of time that the HR trainers measured instructional

effects or used experimental or quasi-experimental designs to measure changes in instructional effects. The results of Johnson and Kusmierek's (1987) study of the evaluation practices of internal HR trainers in comparison with those of the present study indicates that only 10% more of the HR consultants evaluate instructional effects.

For the most part, the majority of HR consultants, in addition to not measuring instructional effects of communication training programs, do not use experimental or quasi-experimental designs when conducting instructional effects evaluations. These findings, while not surprising, are disturbing. When HR consultants provide communication training programs they are in essence hypothesizing a causal relationship between participation in a training program and instructional effects without adequately testing the relationship. Experimental and quasi-experimental research designs provide a means to test this relationship and can control for factors which jeopardize the internal and external validity of the conclusions reached in assessing instructional effects.

The present study's findings regarding the degree to which HR consultants assess changes in observed job performances were very similar to those concerning instructional changes. Again, the findings indicate that limited evaluation research is being conducted in this area and that experimental and quasi-experimental designs are not being used. To ignore this doing this type of evaluation research can only serve to reduce the effectiveness and importance of communication training efforts.

This study also reports that only 13% of the HR consultants

indicated that they conducted cost benefit analyses for communication training programs on frequent or very frequent basis. Johnson and Kusmierek (1987) found similar results among internal HR trainers. That HR consultants are, for the most part, not conducting cost benefit analyses for communication training programs, although not surprising, is still troubling. The fact remains that the goal of HR training rests on the economic benefits it provides to the organization, individual and community. Cost-benefit analyses are central to the assessment of HR training programs, because the basic purpose of training is to change and/or reinforce job related behaviors in order to increase an organization's efficiency, effectiveness or productivity (Johnson, 1986). Quite simply, if an organization hires and pays an HR consultants $75,000 to train its managers in interpersonal skills, it has every right to know what the return on this investment will bring. The economics of HR training requires the use of evaluation research methods that assess the cost-effectiveness of communication training programs.

The results of the present study, although limited to HR consultants who plan, implement, or assess communication training programs, suggests that the "state of the art" of HR training evaluation research is in its infancy. HR consultants interested in providing communication as well as other forms of training must take the necessary steps to ensure more widespread and elaborate use of evaluation research. The quality of HR training programs is dependent on the availability of valid and reliable information which can only be ascertained through evaluation research.

References

Blackburn, R. T. & Clark, M. J. (1975). An assessment of faculty performance: Some correlates between administrators, colleagues, student, and self ratings. Sociology of Education, 48, 242-256.

Brandenburg, D.C. (1982). Training evaluation: What's the current status? Training and Development Journal, 36 (8), 14-18.

Braskamp, L. A., Caulley, D. N. & Costin, F. (1979). Student ratings and instructor self ratings and their relationship to student achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 16, 259-306.

Burke, R.J. (1969). A plea for a systematic evaluation of training. Training and Development Journal, 23 (8). 24-29.

Carlisle, K.E. (1984). Why your training evaluation system doesn't work. Training, 21 (8), 37-40.

Carnevale, A.P. (1986). The learning enterprise. Training and Development Journal, 40 (1), 18-26.

Catalanello, R.F., & Kirkpatrick, D.F. (1968). Evaluating training programs - The state of the art. Training and Development Journal, 22 (5), 2-9.

Clement, R. W. & Aranda, E. H. (1982). Evaluating management training: A contingency approach. Training and Development Journal, 36(8), 39-43.

Cohen, P. A. (1981). Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: A meta-analysis of multisection validity studies. Review of Educational Research, 51, 281-309.

Doyle, K. O., Jr., & Crichton, L. A. (1978). Student, peer, and self evaluation of college instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70, 815-826.

Dunn, G., & Thomas, K. (1985). Surpassing the "smile sheet" approach to evaluating. Training, 22 (4), 65-71.

Feur, D. (1985). Where the dollars go. Training, 22 (10), 45-53.

Goodacre, D.M. III. (1957). The experimental evaluation of management training: Principles and practice. Personnel, 3, 534-538.

Gordon, J. (1986). Training magazine's industry report 1986. Training, 23(10), 26-63.

Gordon, J., Lee, C., & Zemke, R. (1984). Training magazine's industry report, 1984. Training 21 (10), 12-47.

Johnson, J. R. (1986). Planning and developing human resource training materials. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Human Performance Engineering.

Johnson, J. R. & Kusmierek, L. (1987, May). The status of evaluation research in communication training programs. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention. Montreal, Canada.

Kelley, A. I., Orgel, R.F., & Baer, D.M. (1984). Evaluation: The bottom line is closer than you think. Training and Development Journal, 38 (8), 32-37.

Laird, Dugan (1978). Approaches to training and development. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Lampe, S. (1986). Getting the most out of needs assessments. Training, 23(10), 101-104.

Lee, C., Welo, T. & Zemke R. (1983). U.S. training census and trends report, 1983. Training, 20 (10), 8-53.

Lippit, G. I., McCune, S.D., & Church, L.D. (1964). Attitudes of training directors toward the application of research to training programs. Training Directors Journal, 18, 13-20.

Munson, L. S. (1983). How to conduct training seminars. New York: McGraw Hill.

Nadler, L. (1982). Designing training programs: The critical events model. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Ralphs, L. T. & Stephan, E. (1986). HRD in the fortune 500. Training and Development Journal, 40 (10), 69-76.

Zemke, R. (1982) U.S. training census and trends report, 1982. Training, 21(10) 16-80.

Zenger, J.H. , & Hargis, K. (1982). Assessing training results: It's time to take the plunge! Training and Development Journal, 36 (1), 11-16.

Footnote

[1] These percentages were interpolated from data representing the percentage of communication skills training provided by HR trainers and consultants in comparison to other types of HR training.

Table 1

Percentage of HR Consultants Conducting Needs Analyses and
Percentage of HR Consultants Using Various Methods to Conduct Needs Analyses

	Frequency of Usage				
	Rarely (0-15%)	Seldom (16-35%)	Often (36-65%)	Frequently (66-85%)	Very Frequently (86-100%)
HR Consultants-overall	27.1	8.2	21.2	22.4	18.8
Methods:					
Questionnaires	25.9	9.4	20.0	15.3	11.8
Interviews	16.5	9.4	15.3	28.2	23.5
Performance Appraisals	34.1	9.4	8.2	5.9	1.2

Table 2

Percentage of HR Consultants Conducting Implementation Analyses and Percentage of HR Consultants Using Various Methods to Conduct Implementation Analyses

	Frequency of Usage				
	Rarely (0-15%)	Seldom (16-35%)	Often (36-65%)	Frequently (66-85%)	Very Frequently (86-100%)
HR Consultants-overall	11.8	4.7	3.5	16.5	58.8
Methods:					
Questionnaires	10.6	1.2	4.7	17.6	55.3
Interviews	22.4	14.1	14.1	10.6	10.6
Telephone Interviews	38.8	10.6	7.1	4.7	0.0

Table 3

When HR Consultants Administer Attitude Surveys to Trainees

	Immediately after	1-3 wks after	1 mon after	2 mon after	3 mon after	more than 3 mon
Questionnaires	70.6	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.0
Interviews	17.6	15.3	8.2	0.0	2.4	2.7
Telephone Interviews	3.5	15.3	4.7	2.4	1.2	0.0

Table 4

Percentage of HR Consultants Conducting Instructional Effects Analyses and Percentage of HR Consultants Using Various Methods to Conduct Instructional Effects Analyses

	Frequency of Usage				
	Rarely (0-15%)	Seldom (16-35%)	Often (36-65%)	Frequently (66-85%)	Very Frequently (86-100%)
HR Consultants-overall	21.2	10.6	21.2	12.9	27.1
Methods:					
Written Exams	22.4	7.1	18.8	10.6	15.3
Oral Exams	8.2	0.0	10.6	3.5	5.9
Designs:					
Posttest Only	28.3	10.6	8.2	5.9	12.9
Pretest Posttest	25.9	21.2	7.1	12.9	8.2
Control Group	37.6	8.2	5.9	5.9	2.4
Time Series	43.5	3.5	3.5	2.4	1.2
Solomon Four Group	49.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Multiple Baseline	44.7	3.5	3.5	1.2	1.2

Table 5

Duration of Time Between Training and Measurement of Instructional Effects

Duration of Time	% of HR Consultants
Immediately after training	38.8
One to three months after training	16.5
Four to six months after training	1.2
Seven to nine months after training	2.4
Ten to eleven months after training	0.0
One year after training	2.4
More than one year after training	0.0

Table 6

Percentage of HR Consultants Conducting Job Performance Effects Analyses and Percentage of HR Consultants Using Various Methods Conduct Job Performance Effects Analyses

	Frequency of Usage				
	Rarely (0-15%)	Seldom (16-35%)	Often (36-65%)	Frequently (66-85%)	Very Frequently (86-100%)
HR Consultants-overall	32.9	12.9	12.9	16.5	18.8
Methods:					
Interview with trainee	24.7	18.8	16.5	10.6	10.6
Interview with trainee supervisor	20.0	20.2	18.8	15.3	4.7
Interview with trainee subordinate	48.2	8.2	5.9	4.7	1.2
Questionnaire to trainee	27.1	16.5	10.6	10.6	15.3
Questionnaire to trainee supervisor	36.5	9.4	14.1	8.2	4.7
Questionnaire to trainee subordinate	51.8	5.9	4.7	2.4	3.5
Observation	32.9	12.9	11.8	9.4	5.9
Performance Appraisal	40.0	7.1	5.9	9.4	3.5
Designs:					
Posttest Only	43.5	9.4	5.9	2.4	7.1
Pretest Posttest	37.6	16.5	8.2	3.5	10.2
Control Group	44.7	4.7	9.4	3.5	2.4
Time Series	49.4	3.5	2.4	1.2	1.2
Solomon Four Group	52.9	3.5	2.4	0.0	1.2
Multiple Baseline	21.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	2.4

Table 7

Duration of Time Between Training and Measurement of Observed Job Performance

Duration of Time	% of HR Consultants
Immediately after training	23.5
One to three months after training	18.8
Four to six months after training	9.4
Seven to nine months after training	1.2
Ten to eleven months after training	0.0
One year after training	2.4
More than one year after training	0.0

Table 8

Percentage of HR Consultants Conducting Cost Benefit Analyses and Percentage of HR Consultants Using Various Methods Conduct Cost Benefit Analyses

	Frequency of Usage				
	Rarely (0-15%)	Seldom (16-35%)	Often (36-65%)	Frequently (66-85%)	Very Frequently (86-100%)
HR Consultants-overall	43.5	20.2	11.8	8.2	10.8
Variables:					
Cost Reduction	36.5	15.3	7.1	10.6	8.2
Turnover/Retention	41.2	11.8	8.2	8.2	8.2
Number of Grievances	42.4	8.2	10.6	7.1	4.7
Improvement in Product	38.8	8.2	8.2	7.1	8.2
Increase in Morale	36.5	8.2	14.1	9.4	9.4
Decrease in Absenteeism	43.5	10.6	10.6	4.7	4.7